UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Illinois State University

Friday, April 19, 2019
9:30 a.m., Hovey 102

MINUTES

Members present: Frank Beck, Angela Bonnell, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Diane Dean (via telephone), Kevin Edwards, Nancy Novotny (via telephone), Rachel Shively, Sarah Smelser

Members not present: Joe Goodman, Yoon Jin Ma

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

Note: In these minutes "URC" refers to the University Review Committee at Illinois State University; "Caucus" refers to the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate at Illinois State University; "ASPT document" refers to *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies*, Illinois State University; "ASPT 2017" refers to the ASPT document effective January 1, 2017; "ASPT 2022" refers to the ASPT document to be drafted by URC, recommended by the Caucus, and approved by the President to take effect January 1, 2022; and "OEOA" refers to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access at Illinois State University.

I. Call to order

    Vice-Chairperson Sarah Smelser called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. She welcomed committee members.

II. Approval of minutes

    Angela Bonnell moved approval of minutes from the April 5, 2019 URC meeting as distributed to committee members prior to the meeting. Frank Beck seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote with one abstention (Rachel Shively).

III. Update: Equity review plan

    Smelser reported that URC Chairperson Joe Goodman sent committee recommendations regarding ASPT equity review to the Caucus on April 9, 2019. She referred committee members to the URC report to the Caucus included with committee meeting materials. Smelser thanked Shively for preparing the cover memorandum on behalf of the committee. Smelser announced that the committee recommendations are scheduled for discussion by the Caucus at its April 24, 2019 meeting. Sam Catanzaro noted that he, Goodman, and former URC chairperson Doris Houston plan to attend to answer any questions Caucus members may have. Diane Dean said she hopes to attend as well.

IV. ASPT 2022

    Smelser next directed committee members to meeting materials related to development of ASPT 2022, beginning with a tentative project timeline drafted by Catanzaro (see attached). Catanzaro noted that the timeline includes work by a URC writing group in summer 2019 to compile a first draft of ASPT 2022 for consideration by the full committee in fall 2019. Catanzaro recalled that small groups (of shared governance committees) have been impaneled in past summers to work on special projects. He said he believes development of first draft recommendations for ASPT 2022 is worthy of such an approach. He explained that committee members volunteering for service on a small writing group would receive a stipend for doing so. He noted that he has not yet asked Provost Jan Murphy about funding stipends for the project because he first wanted input from URC members regarding their interest in convening such a group. Smelser noted that when URC last impaneled a summer writing group, to draft recommendations to the Caucus regarding the disciplinary articles, work of the writing group was compressed into a short time frame to accommodate working group members' summer schedules. Bonnell added that summer meetings were three or four hours long. She recalled that URC had been challenged during the spring term prior to that summer to complete its work because

committee meetings were limited to one hour. Catanzaro offered as an option to a summer working group having him compile a preliminary draft of ASPT 2022 based on comments and feedback received by URC and then making the preliminary draft available to URC in fall 2019 for review and revision. He said of the two options he would prefer working with URC members this summer rather than waiting until fall to get URC input.

Shively asked about the schedule for completing the first draft, stating that she did not realize that a first draft needs to be completed by October 2019. Catanzaro responded by noting that the draft timeline is ambitious. He said the draft is based on the premise that the Caucus will send URC recommendations regarding the first draft for URC to consider in compiling a second draft of the document for Caucus review. An alternative, Catanzaro offered, would be for URC to spend 2019-2020 compiling a first draft for Caucus review beginning in fall 2020. He noted that he feels strongly that compiling a first draft by October 2019 would allow more time for dialogue between the Caucus and URC, of the quality that occurred during compilation of ASPT 2017 and the disciplinary articles. Dean supported Catanzaro's suggestion that URC complete a first draft by October 2019. She noted that the process worked well for URC before.

Smelser then distributed a draft table of subgroup assignments (see attached). She explained that she and Goodman compiled the draft table to assign ASPT issues suggested by Catanzaro, Kalter, or URC to one of three URC subgroups to begin the ASPT 2022 project. She asked Catanzaro if it is his idea that recommendations from each of the three subgroups would be compiled and sent to the Caucus in October (2019). Catanzaro said that would be ideal. Smelser noted that she and Goodman had difficulty assigning the ASPT issues as evidenced by the unequal distribution of issues across the three subgroups. Shively asked if the issues need to be divided among the three subgroups based on their location in the ASPT document. Smelser responded that URC need not do so. Nancy Novotny asked how many committee members would be in each subgroup. Smelser said subgroups have traditionally had two or three members each. She referred to a guiding principle in the header of the draft assignments table providing that a college may not be the majority composition of any subgroup. She explained that the purpose of that principle is to ensure diversity of college perspectives in all subgroup discussions. Shively asked whether committee members whose term is expiring this spring would participate in the summer working groups. Smelser suggested that those members could continue with the committee into the summer and then be replaced on their subgroups in fall 2019 by the newly-elected representative from their college.

Shively suggested that the committee look more closely at the ASPT issues that have been submitted by Catanzaro and Kalter for URC consideration, noting that some issues may be easier to address than others. Smelser agreed, noting that some issues are editorial such as references to OEOA and the Academic Senate. Catanzaro noted that editorial suggestions could readily be handled by him rather than included on subgroup lists. Smelser pointed out the boldfaced entry for service assignments in the Subgroup 3 list. She explained that she highlighted that entry because it is included on Catanzaro's list, Kalter's list, and the list of issues previously discussed by URC. Smelser recommended designating discussion of service policies a high priority for the working groups, for Subgroup 3. Committee members agreed.

Committee members then discussed the process of prioritizing issues, working from the list titled, "Suggestions and Ideas for ASPT Revisions to be Effective January 1, 2022 by Topic" (see attached). Catanzaro recommended that URC first decide which issues on the list it wants to address, taking into account that some issues overlap, and which issues it does not want to address. He recalled that URC has already decided not to consider including the Distinguished Professor and University Professor awards in the ASPT document. He cautioned that URC will want to consult the Provost before considering any items whose implementation would require additional funding (such as a stepped salary system for full professors).

Committee members decided to assign codes to each item on the list to denote its importance and the time it could take URC to address it. Smelser suggested coding each item as either "high" or "low" (importance) and "short" or "slow" (time). She said it might help URC assign codes if Catanzaro and Kalter were to prioritize the lists they have already submitted. Catanzaro agreed to do so before the next URC meeting. Smelser said she will ask Kalter to do the same. Smelser asked committee members to bring their suggestions regarding importance and time to the next meeting as well. Catanzaro agreed to further explore the feasibility of URC impaneling working groups this summer to discuss the issues. Novotny asked if it is Smelser's intent to finalize the ASPT 2022 timeline and plan before the end of the spring term. Smelser responded in the affirmative. Novotny

suggested scheduling the next URC meeting for more than one hour (to provide more time for committee discussion).

Regarding the next URC meeting, Bruce Stoffel noted that it is tentatively scheduled to take place during finals week (May 6-10). He noted that the date and time of the meeting have yet to be set due to uncertainty earlier in the year regarding committee members' commitments after classes have ended. Smelser asked Stoffel to poll committee members regarding their availability to meet between May 6 and 15, for more than one hour. Shively reported that she would not be able to attend a URC meeting if it is scheduled for May 9 or 10.

V.   Other business

Committee members wished Happy Grandpa Joe Day to Chairperson Joe Goodman, whose first granddaughter, Adelyn Mae Zaitzeff, was born on April 16, 2019.

VI.   Adjournment

Kevin Edwards moved that the meeting adjourn. Shively seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously on voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Shively, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

Timeline for Completion of ASPT 2022, Draft 4-15-19, compiled by Sam Catanzaro, Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, April 2019

ASPT 2022 Working Groups, Draft 4-12-19, compiled by Joe Goodman, University Review Committee Chairperson, and Sarah Smelser, University Review Committee Vice-Chairperson, April 2019

Suggestions and Ideas for ASPT Revisions to be Effective January 1, 2022 by Topic, compiled by Sam Catanzaro, Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, April 2019.

TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION OF ASPT 2022
DRAFT 4-15-19

May 2019	URC compiles a prioritized list of changes to be made to the ASPT document.
Summer 2019	A first draft of ASPT 2022 incorporating those changes is completed. Provost Office to undergo initial pass through (June-July) Potential URC Writing Group to provide a second summer read through (Late July-August)
August-September 2019	URC reviews and revises the first draft of ASPT 2022. If necessary, Subcommittee groups to address complex and newer adjustments.
October 2019	URC submits its first draft of ASPT 2022 to the Faculty Caucus. Fully submitted 25 October 2019
October 2019-March 2020	The Faculty Caucus reviews the first draft of ASPT 2022.
March 2020, preferably before Spring Break	The Faculty Caucus finalizes its feedback to URC regarding the first draft of ASPT 2022.
March-May 2020 (through Summer 2020, if needed)	URC revises the first draft based on feedback received from the Faculty Caucus.
Summer 2020	Secondary Summer Writing Group
August-September 2020	URC submits a second draft of ASPT 2022 to the Faculty Caucus.
October 2020-April 2021	The Faculty Caucus reviews the second draft of ASPT 2022.
March-April 2021	The Faculty Caucus approves ASPT 2022.
May 2021	URC provides instructions to colleges and departments/schools regarding any updates needed to their ASPT standards or guidelines to comply with ASPT 2022.
May-December 2021	Colleges and departments/schools update their ASPT standards and guidelines.
October 2021	Colleges submit their revised ASPT standards to URC.
November-December 2021	URC reviews and approves the revised CFSC standards.
November-December 2021	CFSCs review and approve revised DFSC/SFSC guidelines.
January 1, 2022	ASPT 2022 takes effect.

ASPT 2022 Working Groups (ASPT 22 Working Groups Task Ideas)
Draft 4-12-19 (and 4-19-19)

Guiding Principles:
1. Maintain an efficient and effective ASPT policy for faculty, committees, and administrators.
2. Revise conflicting policies, nomenclatures, or other issues contrary to Illinois State University's mission, by-laws, and shared governance.
3. Articulate clear and precise roles for faculty, committees, and administrators across all ASPT Policies and Procedures.
4. Substantive, non-editorial, changes to ASPT 2017 for the Faculty Caucus' consideration are approved with a majority URC committee vote (50% +1).
5. A College may not be the majority composition of any subgroup.

	Subgroup 1 (ASPT Committee Structure & Appendix Issues)	Subgroup 2 (ASPT P&P, Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure, & Post-Tenure issues)	Subgroup 3 (Performance Evaluation & Salary Increment, Appeals, Personnel Documents Issues)
1.	Policy Development and Revision, CFSC and DFSC/SFSC (Catanzaro, p. 2)	AFEGC, Complaints to (Kalter, p. 3)	Performance Evaluation, Guidelines and Criteria (Catanzaro, p.2)
2.	References to OEOA (Catanzaro, p. 2)	Mid-Probationary Review (Catanzaro, p. 1)	Performance Evaluation (Kalter, p. 4)
3.	References to Academic Senate (Kalter, p. 5)	Promotion, Common Standards (Catanzaro, p. 2)	Performance Evaluation, Teaching (Kalter, p. 4. URC p. 6)
4.	Reporting Requirements (Catanzaro, p. 2. Kalter, p. 5)	Promotion, External Reviewers (Catanzaro, p. 2)	Performance Evaluation, Timing and Documentation (Kalter, p. 4. URC, p. 7)
5.	Conflicts of Interest (Catanzaro, p. 1. Kalter, p. 4)	Tenure, Residency Requirement (Kalter, p. 6)	Appeals, General (Catanzaro, p. 1)
6.	Confidentiality (Kalter, p. 3)	Clinical Professorship (Kalter, p. 3)	Appeals, Non-Reappointment (Catanzaro, p. 1. Kalter, p. 3)
7.	Program Faculty Status Committee (Kalter, p. 5)	Counter Offers (Kalter, p. 4)	Salary Incrementation, Distinguished Prof. & University Prof (Kalter, p. 5)
8.	?? Faculty Assignments (Catanzaro, p. 1)		Salary Incrementation, Stepped Salary System for Full Profs (Kalter, p. 5)
9.			Salary Incrementation (URC, p. 7)
10.			Integrity in Research (Kalter, p. 4)
11.			**Service Assignments (Catanzaro, p. 2. Kalter, p. 5. URC, p. 8)**

Items constituting this list are recommendations received from faculty, URC members, the Faculty Caucus, the Faculty Caucus Chairperson, and the Provost or Provost's designee, ex officio nonvoting representative. Items may be considered as issue(s) arise; however and ideally, substantive ASPT changes will be agreed upon prior to the conclusion of the 2018-2019 URC term.

SUGGESTIONS AND IDEAS FOR ASPT REVISIONS
TO BE EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2022
BY TOPIC

PART A: CATANZARO

APPEALS, GENERAL

The entire article on Appeals could use a thorough review with an eye toward clarification and streamlining. Also, I think we might consider developing and requiring a standardized form for the two steps in every appeal, with the goal to help faculty understand just what is needed or not needed at each step.
Section(s): XVII, XVII.B (request of a formal meeting), XVII.C (appeal statements)

APPEALS, NON-REAPPOINTMENT

Consider clarifications as needed given that these are relatively new provisions. (Note that, currently, Catanzaro recommends against expanding CFSC review of DFSC/SFSC non-reappointment recommendations, in contrast to Kalter).
Section(s): XVII.K
[See also Part B: Kalter et al.]

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Add more explicit language about conflicts of interest and their management.
Section(s): I.B

DISCIPLINARY POLICIES

Review Disciplinary Policies in light of any experience with them (because they are relatively new).
Section(s): XII through XV

FACULTY ASSIGNMENTS

Clarify chair/director role and responsibilities in making faculty assignments.
Section(s): VII.B

MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW

Consider developing a requirement of, and attendant guidelines for, mid-probationary review. Probably not to go beyond department unless it results in non-reappointment, in which instance the non-reappointment policies in XI and appeals policies in XVII.K apply and there is no need for additional policies. Use CAS as a model.
Section(s): IX

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION, GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA

Thorough review for clarity and to update items. Add language emphasizing more strongly that the list is considered illustrative, not exhaustive. Consider including guidelines for faculty presenting evidence not included in list.
Section(s): Appendix 2
[See also Part C: URC]

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND REVISION, CFSC and DFSC/SFSC

Consider clarification of CFSC and DFSC/SFSC responsibilities for policy development, college/department/school procedures, and timelines for changes.
Section(s): IV and V

PROMOTION, COMMON STANDARDS

Rewrite last two sentences to clarify two distinctions: (1) the difference between criteria for promotion (provided in VIII.F1 and VIII.F2) and the evidence presented that the criteria have been met (provided in Appendix 2), and (2) how Appendix 2 should and should not be used.
Section(s): VIII.F

PROMOTION, EXTERNAL REVIEWS

Require external review of scholarly/creative contributions for promotion (see IX.D). Use CAS as a model.
Section(s): VIII.E, IX.D

REFERENCES (TO OEOA)

Update name of OEOA.
Section(s): throughout the document

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Consider clarification of reporting requirements and process for each committee (FRC, CFSC, DFSC/SFSC).
Section(s): III through V
 [See also Part B: Kalter et al.]

SERVICE

Clarification of expectations about service as part of faculty role (in general) and faculty assignments**.**
Consider explication of service expectations in light of language about assignments.
Section(s): Overview, VII
[See also Part B: Kalter et al. and Part C: URC]

PART B: KALTER ET AL.

AFEGC, COMPLAINTS TO

Make sure ASPT policies explicitly permit a faculty member to individually enter a complaint with AFEGC regarding performance evaluations, tenure and promotion decisions, and post-tenure review rather than just permitting an ASPT committee to do so. Follow national standards in this regard.
Section(s): VII.F, XVII.G.2-4, XVII.I.1, XVII.J.1 and elsewhere

Make sure ASPT Article XII [sic] (Appeals Policies and Procedures) conforms to the referrals part of the jurisdiction of AFEGC in University Policy 3.3.8.
Section(s): XVII

Make sure AFEGC is mentioned where needed whenever violations of academic freedom are mentioned, or make sure the reader is referred to an appeals section where AFEGC is mentioned.
Section(s): throughout the document

Compare mention of AFEGC in ASPT policies with current AFEGC policy to identify gaps and conflicts.
Section(s): throughout the document

APPEALS, NON-REAPPOINTMENT

Consider expanding the right to file an appeal with CFSC to include a general appeal, in addition to a procedural appeal, so CFSC may correct or call attention to any potential bad situation with a DFSC that might arise.
Section(s): XVII.K
[See also Part A: Catanzaro]

In non-reappointment policies, make sure the timeline and notifications processes for AFEGC appeals (whether referrals or complaints) is quite clear (so that the Provost does not prematurely send out a final notification).
Section(s): XVII.K.4, Appendix 8

CLINICAL PROFESSORSHIP

Adding a Clinical Professorship to the faculty ranks. In ASPT policies and also as an amendment to 3.3.3.
Section(s): Overview and throughout the document

CONFIDENTIALITY

Consider rewording Section I.D (regarding confidentiality) to clarify that DFSCs, SFSCs, and CFSCs may openly talk about ASPT policies and other committee business for which there is no need for confidential treatment. Consider clarifying that the confidentiality of the ASPT process cannot be used as a gag rule that prevents AFEGC from thoroughly investigating referrals/complaints regarding ethics or academic freedom violations in ASPT deliberations. AFEGC hearings must be conducted in ways that keep confidential issues confidential, but that allow the AFEGC hearing panel into the confidences (with the same expectation of keeping those confidences).
Section(s): I.D

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Regarding the last sentence of Section I.B: "No persons at any level may participate in deliberations regarding their own evaluations or those of spouses or other relatives by law or by consanguinity." Should this exclusion be expanded in light of discussions by the Academic Senate regarding the proposed Amorous Relations policy (nee Consensual Relations policy)?
Section(s): I.B

COUNTEROFFERS

When making a counteroffer to retain a faculty member who has a job offer another institution, consider allowing the Provost to raise the salaries of similarly situated faculty members in the same department (not just the faculty member to whom the counteroffer was made).
Section(s): XVI and elsewhere

INTEGRITY IN RESEARCH

Compare the Integrity in Research and Scholarly Activities policy to ASPT policy and identify areas in the ASPT policy where the integrity policy may need to be mentioned. Just as we mention AFEGC in ASPT, and just as URC has been charged with making sure these AFEGC references appear in all the right places and are consistent with national norms, URC might recommend changes to the AFEGC policy or the integrity policy if either policy is inadequate in this regard.
Section(s): throughout the document

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

For tenured professors, consider evaluating scholarship once every three years, teaching once every three years, and service once every three years.
Section(s): VII, XVI
[See also Part C: URC]

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION, TEACHING

Incorporate changes recommended by URC to Appendix 2 since adoption of ASPT 2017 regarding evaluation of teaching. Related review the report of the ad hoc Teaching Learning Community group that met in 2018-2019 (at the request of the Faculty Caucus?) to examine student responses to instruction. See the Academic Senate office or Dr. Kalter for the report.
Section(s): Appendix 2
[See also Part C: URC]

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION, TIMELINE

Consider relaxing the deadline for DFSC/SFSC completion of performance evaluations to give those committees more time to complete their work. Perhaps extend the deadline for completion of tenured persons' letters.
Section(s): Appendix 1

PROGRAM FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE

Consider providing for establishment of Program Faculty Status Committees for evaluation of faculty members hired to teach interdisciplinary programs (e.g., Arts Technology, African American Studies, Women and Gender Studies). The idea is that such committee could only apply to programs that are not wholly housed in a single department. Consider inviting Provost Murphy to share her thoughts regarding this suggestion.
Section(s): ASPT Committee Structure and elsewhere throughout the document

REFERENCES (TO ACADEMIC SENATE)

Replace references in ASPT policies to "Academic Senate" with references to "Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate."
Section(s): throughout the document

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Review item 5) in Section II.E to clarify its intent and meaning and to clarify what the report is to consist of and why. Is this being done? Should it be? If so, what processes and procedures should be followed?
Section(s): II.E
[See also Part A: Catanzaro]

SALARY INCREMENTATION, DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR AND UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR

Discuss whether the practice of granting a rise in base salary to faculty members granted Distinguished Professor or University Professor status should be addressed in ASPT policies (through the addition to the ASPT document of policies and procedures for doing so).
Section(s): VIII and XVI

SALARY INCREMENTATION, STEPPED SALARY SYSTEM FOR FULL PROFESSORS

Explore the wisdom and feasibility of a stepped salary system at the full professor rank, such as those negotiated at other state universities through unions. The idea is that once an individual receives the full professor rank, they would stay at that rank, but their productivity afterward would make them eligible for a bump increase after a certain set number of years and stated productivity expectations, similar to a promotional increment, with limits on the number of bumps and their spacing. It is quite possible that this system is either not wise or not feasible here at ISU, or both, but we should find out and see if we can be more competitive if we adopted such a system.
Section(s): VIII, XVI
[See also Part C: URC]

SERVICE

Provide clarification in ASPT policies regarding expectation of faculty regarding service contributions, how service is assigned, and how service is evaluated in annual performance evaluations.
Section(s): Overview (page 2), VII
[See also Part A: Catanzaro and Part C: URC]

TENURE, RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT

Consider a residency requirement for tenure eligibility. That is, consider requiring that a faculty member come to campus to teach and serve on a regular basis and not allow the granting tenure to a faculty member who Skypes into their classes and serves only virtually on committees or not at all.
Section(s): IX.C

PART C: URC

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION, TEACHING

The Working Group on Students Evaluations (Christopher Horvath and Andy Rummel, Spring 2016) recommended against referring to end-of-term course surveys as evaluative, rather referring to them as opportunities for student responses regarding their experiences with a particular instructor or course. The working group recommended against requiring equal weighting of the sources of input used by an ASPT committee to evaluate teaching performance. The working group suggested adding language to the ASPT document that "encourages schools/departments to develop methods of teaching evaluation that take into consideration multiple sources of input over an extended period of time and weight the various sources of data in ways appropriate to the particular the faculty member, course load, pedagogy, course content, and discipline." URC approved the working group report on May 13, 2016.

The Working Group on Teaching Evaluations (Michael Byrns, Rachel Shively, and Sarah Smelser, Fall 2017) reviewed recommendations of the Working Group on Student Evaluations and concurred with them. The working group recommended modifying Appendix 2 to encourage units to adopt a holistic approach to evaluation of teaching and to include self-reflection among possible methods of evaluation. At its November 10, 2017 meeting, URC approved a motion to recommend replacing the passage in Appendix 2 headed "Factors Used for Evaluation of Teaching" (on pages 96-97 of ASPT 2019) with the following passage.

> **Factors Used for Evaluation of Teaching**
>
> Guidelines and criteria for the evaluation of teaching are based on common teaching activities such as those listed above. Those who evaluate teaching should take into consideration multiple types of evidence over an extended period of time and weigh the various sources of data in ways appropriate to particular faculty members and their situations. One such source of data must be student reactions to teaching performance. When evaluating student reactions to teaching, reviewers should consider factors that can influence the data collected, including course load, instructional method, course content, discipline, potential sources of bias, etc. In addition to student reactions, other sources of evidence that may be used to identify meritorious teaching include, but are not limited to, the following:
>
> 1. A record of solidly favorable student reactions to teaching performance;
> 2. Favorable teaching ratings by peers through review of instructional materials;
> 3. Favorable teaching ratings by peers through classroom observation;
> 4. Favorable teaching reactions by alumni;
> 5. A narrative self-reflection on teaching performance;
> 6. Evidence that the faculty member's students experience cognitive or affective gain as a result of their instruction;
> 7. Syllabi from various courses that feature clarity of instructional objectives, clear organization of material, and equitable and understandable criteria for the evaluation of student work;
> 8. Breadth of teaching ability as this is illustrated by effective teaching in different classroom settings, effective teaching of different types of students, preparation of new courses, or significant modification of established courses;
> 9. Evidence of meritorious supervision of students in independent studies, internships, clinical experiences, laboratories, and field work;

10. Credible advising and mentoring of students in their preparation of research projects, theses, and dissertations;
11. Significant involvement in sponsoring student organizations and co-curricular activities;
12. Development or review of teaching materials (textbooks, workbooks, reading packets, computer programs, curriculum guides, etc.);
13. Development of new teaching techniques (videotapes, independent study modules, computer activities, instructional technologies, etc.);
14. Service as a master teacher to others (conducting teaching workshops, supervising beginning teachers, coaching performances, etc.);
15. Recognition of meritorious teaching by winning teaching awards;
16. Submitting successful competitive grant proposals related to teaching.

Section(s): VII, XVI.B, Appendix 2
[See also Part B: Kalter et al.]

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION, TIMING AND DOCUMENTATION

The URC Working Group on Annual Performance Evaluations (Angela Bonnell, Rick Boser, and Sheryl Jenkins, Spring 2016) recommended against conducting performance evaluations every other year rather than every year, recommended against conducting performance evaluations annually for probationary faculty but every other year for tenured faculty, and recommended against introducing language in the ASPT document for reducing the extent of performance evaluation documentation submitted by faculty members. The working group recommended that departments/schools review and revise as necessary policies and procedures regarding faculty activity reports, taking into consideration the time faculty spend in preparing the required elements of the reports. The working group recommended sharing of individual unit practices with regard to activity reporting in a university-wide setting. URC approved the working group report on May 13, 2016.
Section(s): VII, XVI.B
[See also Part B: Kalter et al.]

SALARY INCREMENTATION

The Working Group on Tenure and Promotion Salary Increases (Joe Goodman and David Rubin, Spring 2016) concluded that a full departure from the precedent at the University of using fixed monetary salary increments (rather than percentage-based increments) appears unwarranted. The working group recommended a full peer group compensation survey be conducted to examine salary increment amounts at Illinois State, which, the working group, observed are below the mean and median of the IBHE peer comparison group. The working group recommended a full evaluation of faculty turnover rates and costs by academic rank. The working group report cited the "salary enhancement policy" utilized by West Virginia University. URC approved the working group report on April 27, 2016.
Section(s): VIII, XVI.A
[See also Part B: Kalter et al.]

SERVICE

URC discussed service assignments in fall 2018. Committee members reviewed DFSC/SFSC guidelines to determine current policies and practices regarding service. Committee members discussed their findings at the October 18, 2018 URC meeting. No report regarding service was placed on record and no motions were made regarding the issue. Suggestions of individual committee members cited in URC meeting minutes include citing in the ASPT document that service is an implicit responsibility of faculty (with or without further citing service in the ASPT document), asking CFSCs to determine if there are concerns in their units regarding service and, if so, to address them, not prescribing in the ASPT document a point system for service assignments or evaluation, asking that units be clear about their service policies in their ASPT guidelines.
Section(s): Overview (page 2), VII
[See also Part A: Catanzaro]
[See also Part B: Kalter et al.]